

1 **NOSSAMAN LLP**  
2 CHRISTOPHER D. HUGHES (SBN 254864)  
3 chughes@nossaman.com  
4 621 Capitol Mall, Suite 2500  
5 Sacramento, CA 95814  
6 Telephone: 916.442.8888  
7 Facsimile: 916.442.0382

8 Attorneys for Panoramic Investments,  
9 Creditor

10  
11 **UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**  
12 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
13 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

14 In re  
15 PG&E CORPORATION,  
16 - and -  
17 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY,  
18  
19 Debtors.

Case No: 19-30088 (DM)  
Chapter 7

**PANORAMIC INTERESTS' RESPONSE  
TO DEBTORS' TWENTY-SECOND  
OMNIBUS OBJECTION TO CLAIM  
(SATISFIED CLAIMS)**

Date: November 17, 2020  
Time: 10:00 a.m. (Pacific Time)  
Room: (Telephonic Appearances Only)  
United States Bankruptcy Court  
Courtroom 17, 16<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94102

22  
23 Panoramic Interests ("Panoramic" or "Creditor") hereby submit this *Response*  
24 (**"Response"**) to Debtors' Twenty Second Omnibus Objection to Claim (Satisfied Claims)  
25 (**"Objection to Claim"**). This Response is supported by the declaration of Patrick Kennedy and  
26 the Exhibit A, (the **"Panoramic Proof of Claim"**).

27 According to the Objection to Claim, Debtors are asserting that the Panoramic Proof of  
28 Claim should be disallowed because the claim was already paid by the Debtors pursuant to the

1 *Final Order Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 105(a), 363(b), and 507(a)(7) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 6003*  
2 *and 6004 (I) Authorizing Debtors to (A) Maintain and Administer Customer Programs,*  
3 *Including Public Purpose Programs, and (B) Honor Any Prepetition Obligations Relating*  
4 *Thereto; and (II) Authorizing Financial Institutions to Honor and Process Related Checks and*  
5 *Transfer* [Docket No. 843]

6 The documents submitted with the Panoramic Proof of Claim accurately reflect the  
7 services provided and the fees that were to be paid for the services. The services relate to a  
8 PG&E gas installation at 2711 Shattuck, Berkeley, California. The Panoramic Proof of Claim  
9 accurately reflects the events that transpired between April 22, 2017 and June 4, 2018.

10 Contrary to Debtors' assertion in the Objection to Claim, Panoramic did not receive any  
11 payment for the services identified on the documents submitted with the Panoramic Proof of  
12 Claim.

13 On October 28, 2020, emails were sent to counsel for the Debtors, asking for a copy of  
14 any payment to Panoramic which would support the Debtors' assertion in the Objection to  
15 Claim. Several follow up emails were also sent in November and December, 2020. Although  
16 Debtors' counsel twice agreed to continue the hearing on the Objection to Claim while they  
17 investigated, Debtors have not provided any documents to support the assertion in the Objection  
18 to Claim. On the morning of January 4, 2021 (the current due date for Panoramic's Response to  
19 the Objection to Claim), an additional email was sent to Debtors' counsel and a voice message  
20 was left for Debtors' counsel. No response was received before this Response was filed. While  
21 Creditor acknowledges the unenviable task of administrating all of the pending objections to  
22 claims in this case, Creditor cannot risk missing the deadline of 4:00 p.m.

23 All allegations set forth in a properly filed proof of claim are taken as true and, if the  
24 allegations set forth all facts necessary to establish a claim and are not self-contradictory, the  
25 proof constitutes *prima facie* evidence of the validity and amount of the claim. 11 U.S.C. §  
26 502(a); Fed.R.Bankr.P. 3001(f). Only after the objecting party raises "facts tending to defeat the  
27 claim by probative force equal to that of the allegations of the proofs of claim themselves,"  
28 (*Wright v. Holm (In re Holm)*, 931 F.2d 620, 623 (9th Cir. 1991)), then "the burden reverts to the

1 claimant to prove the validity of the claim by a preponderance of the evidence.” *Ashford v.*  
2 *Consolidated Pioneer Mortgage (In re Consolidated Pioneer Mortgage)*, 178 B.R. 222, 226  
3 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1995), *aff’d*, 91 F.3d 151 (9th Cir. 1996). “[T]he ultimate burden of persuasion  
4 is always on the claimant.” *Holm*, 931 F.2d at 623.

5 In this case, the Panoramic Proof of Claim sets forth all facts necessary to establish the  
6 validity of the claim and the amount owed to Panoramic. The proof of claim constitutes *prima*  
7 *facie* evidence of the validity and amount of the claim. While Panoramic appreciates the Debtors  
8 acknowledging that the services identified in the Panoramic Proof of Claim should have been  
9 paid in full pursuant to the Court’s March 12, 2019 order [Docket No. 843], Panoramic was not  
10 paid for the services identified in the Panoramic Proof of Claim. Other than a conclusory  
11 declaration, Debtors have not provided any evidence to reflect that they have paid Panoramic in  
12 full for the services identified in the Panoramic Proof of Claim. Debtors have not provided a  
13 copy of the payment they assert was made to Panoramic, nor have Debtors provided any  
14 additional details such as the amount or date of the purported payment. Mr. Kennedy’s  
15 declaration states that no such payment was received by Panoramic. Consequently, the  
16 Objection to Claim should be denied.

17  
18 Date: January 4, 2021

NOSSAMAN LLP

19  
20 /s/ Christopher D. Hughes  
21 Christopher D. Hughes, Attorney for  
22 Panoramic Interests, Creditor  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28